Programs Branch

User Report

FINAL REPORT OF THE STUDY FOR THE PLANNING OF VICTIM ASSISTANCE SERVICES IN RICHMOND, B.C.: VOLUME I

NO. 1984-28

87-04222/

Colin Meredith
Abt Associates of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario

FINAL REPORT OF THE STUDY FOR THE PLANNING OF VICTIM ASSISTANCE SERVICES IN RICHMOND, B.C.: VOLUME I

NO. 1984-28

This working paper was prepared under contract for the Research Division in 1983 and is made available as submitted to the Ministry. The views expressed are those of the author and are not necessarily those of the Ministry of the Solicitor General of Canada.

This working paper is available in French. Ce document de travail est disponible en français.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	
I	INTRODUCTION	1
II	METHODOLOGY	5
	A. Victim interviews	5
	B. Witness interviews	7
	C. The agency inventory	8
	D. Criminal justice system indicators	10
	E. Interviews with key officials	11
III	FINDINGS	15
	A. General victims	16
	B. Victims of wife assault	38
	C. Crown witnesses	49
IV	THE ROLE OF RESEARCH	55
	GENERAL REFERENCES	
	APPENDICES	
	A. Table of contents of Volume II: Technical Report	
	B. Sample Victim Information Form (VIF)	
	C. Sample Witness Information Form (WIF)	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In March of 1982, the Ministry of the Solicitor General commissioned the 'Study for the Planning of Victim Assistance Services in Richmond, B.C.' A supplementary examination of the experiences of subpoenaed witnesses (sponsored by the Ministry of Justice) was added in August of 1982. The research was performed in two distinct phases: in Phase I, a methodology proposal was developed and presented for approval to the project steering committee; in Phase II, the data collection activities described in the proposal were performed. This report presents the findings of this research. A companion document to this report (referred to as Volume II) provides detailed tables of results for the interested reader.

The conduct of this study was guided by both the Research Division of the Ministry of the Solicitor General and the Richmond Committee on Victim Assistance (R.C.V.A.). R.C.V.A. membership included representatives of the R.C.M.P., the Consultation Centre (Solicitor General), the B.C. Ministry of the Attorney General, the B.C. Ministry of Human Resources, the Richmond Community Services Council and Richmond Family Court.

The research methodology was designed with two objectives in mind. The first was to ensure that decisions on the kinds of services to implement (if any) would be based on sound information about which services are most needed. The second objective was to provide some of the information needed if the effectiveness of possible future initiatives is to be evaluated. In responding to these two broad objectives, the methodology development focussed on providing answers to eight general planning questions (listed in the table below).

Planning questions addressed

Planning Questions	
1.	What are the immediate impacts of the crime on victims in Richmond (trauma, injury, financial losses)?
2.	What are the longer term impacts of the crime on victims in Richmond (lasting emotional effects and injuries, net financial losses)?
3.	What are the victims' expressed needs for services immediately after the crime?
4.	What are the victims' expressed needs for services six months after the crime?
5.	What is the level of awareness/use among victims of services available in Richmond?
6.	What are the impacts on victims of the way the police/courts currently deal with crime victims?
7.	What services are currently available to crime victims in Richmond?
8.	What approaches to providing services to crime victims in Richmond are more feasible than others?

Methodology. Five different types of information were gathered to support these planning and evaluation objectives. The largest and most complex data set was obtained by interviewing a sample of victims on two separate occasions. The first contact occurred a week or so after the crime was reported and focussed on immediate victim needs. The second interview took place approximately six months later and examined longer term victim needs. In this way we were able to measure both the immediate and longer term impacts of the crime and corresponding victim needs.

The second data gathering task involved the interviewing by telephone of a sample of Crown witnesses. Those individuals, some of whom were the victims

of the offenses tried, were asked about their experiences with all aspects of the court process from subpoena to sentencing.

The third distinct data gathering task involved the compilation of a list of available services which might be of value to crime victims in Richmond. This list also helped us to determine whether any gaps existed in the social service network available to crime victims.

The fourth major component of our research consisted of baseline measures of a number of criminal justice system indicators. These measures will serve mostly to detect changes in system functioning which may occur as victim services are put in place. This information will provide for the eventual limited assessment of the costs and benefits of the services. In the meantime, these data will also support the program planning process.

Finally, informal interviews were conducted with a number of 'key officials' in the Richmond area. Interviewees included police and court personnel, and representatives of social service agencies. Through these contacts, we hoped to develop an understanding of relevant local concerns and issues, and to ensure the feasibility of recommendations offered in a separate report prepared specifically for use in Richmond.

Separate analyses were performed for each of three major 'populations' surveyed: victims of general crime, victims of wife assault and subpoenaed Crown witnesses. The major findings of each survey were as follows.

MAJOR FINDINGS

Victims of general crime

- Among victims of property loss and damage crimes, average values of loss/damage were generally low (under $100). The items most often

reported stolen and/or damaged were motor vehicle parts and accessories, bicycles, and dwelling structures. Many but not all of these losses were covered by insurance. As an alternative recovery strategy, a majority of the victims interviewed expressed support for the concept of direct restitution by convicted offenders.

- Only 8% of the victims interviewed reported any injury as a result of their victimization. Medical treatment was required in less than half of these cases. The survey results indicated that awareness and use of the services of the Criminal Injuries Compensation Board was low, even among injured victims.

- The predominant emotional reactions to the reported crimes were anger and various expressions of nervousness and fear. A sizable proportion of the interviewed victims (24%) reported a need for someone to talk to about what happened to them. Over 90% of the victims interviewed were able to discuss the incident with their families and friends. A number of social agencies in Richmond are also available to provide counselling.

- Advice on practical matters such as how to report stolen credit cards or file insurance claims would have been of help to 23% of the victims surveyed. In addition, 19% of the survey respondents reported a need for more crime prevention information. This finding was somewhat surprising in that increased use of crime prevention measures was reported by the overwhelming majority of the victims interviewed.

- One of the greatest needs identified by the study was that of providing more information to victims on services available to them. An agency inventory conducted as part of this study identified 29 agencies offering services of potential value to Richmond's crime victims. Related data, however, indicated that awareness of these

services was low both among victims and among criminal justice and social services system personnel.

- The victim survey results indicated general satisfaction with the services provided by the police. Needs were, however, expressed for more information on case progress, more information on crime prevention measures and more information on other services available to help with their problems.

Victims of wife assault

- The volume of wife assault cases being reported to the Richmond R.C.M.P. was found to be surprisingly low. Over the study period of approximately six months, routine scanning of occurrence reports identified an average of one eligible case per month.

- A need for emergency financial assistance was reported by 22% of the (18) wife assault victims surveyed. To some extent, such help is available from the Ministry of Human Resources. Welfare is clearly not, however, the optimal long-term solution.

- Extensive emotional reactions to their assaults were reported by almost all of the victims interviewed: 89% were 'nervous' and 'crying/shaking'; 83% were 'angry' and 'afraid for own safety.' Needs for 'someone to talk to' and 'someone to keep the victim company' were reported by 50% of survey respondents. Fortunately, 83% of these individuals were able to discuss their concerns with a family member or friend. Other helping resources are also available in Richmond, including a transition house offering both counselling support and accommodation.

- The wife assault surveys identified needs for two types of practical assistance: emergency shelter (27% of respondents) and emergency

transportation (17%). Emergency shelter for wife assault victims is available from the NOVA Transition House. Our data, however, indicated a low level of awareness of the services provided by NOVA, even among these victims (44% were aware of NOVA) and among police officers.

- The information needs of wife assault victims focussed on two areas: information on help available from social service agencies, and information on criminal justice system procedures. This first finding is consistent with the data obtained in the survey of general crime victims. The types of information needed on justice system procedures related to the practicalities of charging, and alternatives to criminal prosecution.

- As was the case for the general surveys, the wife assault victims typically reported satisfaction (overall) with the way in which the police responded to their problems. The only exception to this concerned the apparent reluctance of some officers to proceed with charges.

Crown witnesses

- The average elapsed time between the crime and the conclusion of the trial was seven months.

- Over 90% of the witnesses interviewed indicated that they understood their requirement to appear in court as embodied in their subpoenae.

- Only 7% of the witnesses interviewed sought any legal advice or assistance for themselves. Typically, these individuals were the victims of the crimes being tried.

- Little evidence of witness intimidation was produced by the surveys.

- Only 22% of the witnesses had any contact with the Crown Prosecutor following completion of their trials. As a result, many (20%) were unaware of the outcome of the trial.

- 29% of the witnesses reported some salary loss (average $92) as a result of their requirement to attend court.

- Approximately half of the witnesses interviewed indicated that more advance information about court procedures would have been helpful to them.

In general, the data gathered in the course of this study indicated that major new initiatives were not required to meet the needs of crime victims and witnesses in Richmond. Rather, the optimum approach sufficient to meet identified needs would involve certain changes in criminal justice system procedures, and improved integration and coordination of existing services. The only exception to this general finding concerns the needs of wife assault victims. While the data gathered for this study on the problem of wife assault reflected the experiences of relatively few individuals, it was apparent from these data that many of these people are in need of more positive support from the police and courts, as well as from society at large.

I

INTRODUCTION

In March of 1982, the Ministry of the Solicitor General commissioned a 'Study for the Planning of Victim Assistance Services in Richmond, B.C.' A supplementary examination of the experiences of subpoenaed witnesses (sponsored by the Ministry of Justice) was added in August of 1982. The research was performed in two distinct phases: in Phase I, a methodology proposal was developed and presented for approval to the project steering committee; in Phase II, the data collection activities described in the proposal were performed. This report presents and discusses the findings of this study.

The conduct of this study was guided by both the Research Division of the Ministry of the Solicitor General and the Richmond Committee on Victim Assistance (R.C.V.A.). R.C.V.A. membership included representatives of the R.C.M.P., the Consultation Centre (Solicitor General), the B.C. Ministry of the Attorney General, the B.C. Ministry of Human Resources, the Richmond Community Services Council and Richmond Family Court.

Several distinct types of activities were performed in support of the development of the methodology. Firstly, we reviewed available research literature on both Canadian and American victim assistance programs. Secondly, we conferred with a number of prominent victim assistance researchers working in both Canada and the United States. Thirdly, we consulted with representatives of various organizations in Richmond (including the members of the steering committee). Finally, we examined the information available in agency records of potential relevance to this project.

The research methodology was designed with two objectives in mind. The first was to ensure that decisions on the kinds of services to implement would be based on sound information about which services are most needed. The range of

services which could potentially be offered to victims is extensive (Exhibit I-1 presents a partial list). However, little information was available previously as to which of these services are most needed or on how effective these services really are. The fact is that most of what we now know in this area comes from American sources, even though a number of different victim assistance services have recently been implemented in Canada. Unfortunately, however, few victim-assistance programs in Canada or the U.S. were developed on the basis of in-depth studies of victims, and only superficial data are available at present on their effectiveness.

The second objective of the research described in this report was to provide some of the information needed if the effectiveness of possible initiatives to be implemented in the future is to be evaluated. Some of the information collected during the study was useful not only for planning purposes but will also serve as "baseline" data for future research. As a result, it will be possible later to perform some before and after comparisons of the impacts and cost-effectiveness of the services. The lack of such baseline data accounts in part for the lack of effectiveness information on many of the American programs despite the expenditure of over $500 million on victim services since 1974. Most of this money was spent directly on services. When research was performed, it was often attempted only after the program had become operational. Consequently, baseline data were not available, and the researchers were not able to document many of the anticipated impacts of the services (particularly those "spin-off" impacts presumed to benefit the criminal justice system agencies involved).

In responding to these two broad objectives, the methodology development focussed on providing answers to eight general planning questions. (Exhibit I-2 lists these questions.) In Chapter II of this report, the details of the methodology are described. Chapter III presents and discusses the findings of the various data collection activities. A companion document to this report (referred to as Volume II) provides detailed tables of results for the interested reader.

Exhibit I-1 Partial list of potential services for crime victims

Type of Need

1. Immediate (Crisis)

    1. Medical aid
    2. Financial aid
    3. Counselling/emotional support
    4. Referral to agency
    5. Transportation
    6. Repairs to property/immediate security
    7. Crime prevention information
    8. Information on role of insurance companies
    9. Information on options and procedures available to victim to lay charges
    10. Information on procedures (what to do, information on available social services, recovery of stolen goods, contacting insurance company, and credit card company)
    11. Police concern/sensitivity
    12. Others concern/sensitivity -- landlords, witnesses

2. Long-term (on-going)

    A. In dealing with police

        1. Information on status of case
        2. Assistance in prompt return of stolen property
        3. Counselling/emotional support
        4. Referral to other agencies
        5. Assistance in making insurance claims
        6. Assistance in crime compensation application
        7. Information about security measures/crime prevention
        8. Greater police vigilance

    B. In dealing with courts

        1. Explanation of subpoena
        2. Explanation of court procedures/functioning of criminal justice system/role of witness
        3. Changes in court scheduling
        4. Information about restitution
        5. Information about witness fees
        6. Information about case outcome
        7. Information about services (parking, day-care, etc.)
        8. Information on role of employer
        9. Court reception area for witness (e.g., to reduce fear of being near accused)

Exhibit I-1 Partial list of potential services for crime victims (Continued)

C. In dealing with other agencies

1. Referral to social agencies
2. Information on role of social agencies to victims
3. Assistance in crime compensation application

Exhibit I-2 Planning questions

Planning Questions
1. What are the immediate impacts of the crime on victims in Richmond (trauma, injury, financial losses)?
2. What are the longer term impacts of the crime on victims in Richmond (lasting emotional effects and injuries, net financial losses)?
3. What are the victims' expressed needs for services immediately after the crime?
4. What are the victims' expressed needs for services six months after the crime?
5. What is the level of awareness/use among victims of services available in Richmond?
6. What are the impacts on victims of the way the police/courts currently deal with crime victims?
7. What services are currently available to crime victims in Richmond?
8. What approaches to providing services to crime victims in Richmond are more feasible than others?

II

METHODOLOGY

We gathered five different types of information to support our planning and evaluation objectives. The resulting data sets consisted of survey completions with samples of victims and witnesses, an inventory of relevant services available in Richmond, baseline measures of a number of criminal justice system indicators, and information obtained in interviews with local officials. The approaches used to gather these data were as follows:

A. VICTIM INTERVIEWS

Survey questionnaires suitable for administration by telephone were developed for both general crime victims and victims of wife assault. For each of these two groups, one questionnaire was designed to collect data within a week or so of the crime being reported. A second set of two questionnaires was also developed for a six-month follow-up survey of all victims completing the first survey. (Copies of these instruments are provided in Volume II of this report.) The objective in attempting two contacts with these individuals was to measure both the immediate and longer-term impacts of the crime, and corresponding victim needs.

The victims of general crime to be interviewed were identified from Occurrence Reports received by the Richmond Detachment of the R.C.M.P. in August and early September of 1982. Reported incidents were classified into one of five categories:

1. Threat and/or attack events, e.g. assaults.

2. Property loss and/or damage events, e.g. theft.

3. Combined 1 and 2 above, e.g. robbery.

4. Regulatory events, e.g. drunk driving.

5. Incomplete events.

Victims of type 1, 2 and 3 events were eligible for inclusion in our survey sample. Commercial and institutional victims (e.g. stores and schools) and individuals under the age of 16 were excluded.

First survey interviews were completed with 227 victims of general crimes, of whom 77 were victims of threat/attack crimes, and 150 were victims of loss/damage crimes. The 77 threat/attack victims represented a virtual census (or 100% sample) of victims of this crime type reported during the study period. The 150 loss/damage victims interviewed were a randomly-selected 50% (approximately) of all victims of this crime type reported during the study period. The completion rate achieved on these first interviews of general victims was 100% meaning that the interviewers were able to contact all of the victims in the sample, and none of the victims refused to complete an interview.

Second survey interviews of general victims (the six-month follow-up) were completed with 131 out of a possible 227 victims for a completion rate of 58%. The most frequent reasons for non-completion of these interviews were respondent refusal and inability to contact the victim at the telephone number on file. A check was made of the extent to which the general composition of the first and second survey samples were comparable. The results of these tests gave no indication that the attrition in our sample was systematically related to offense type or victim demographics.

Our target for the interviews of wife assault victims was to complete 25 'first' interviews and as many follow-ups as possible (from among the 25 first survey completions). Over the period from mid-August to the end of January, only 29 eligible cases were identified in the Richmond Occurrence Reports files. Of these 29 cases, we were able to complete interviews with 18 for a completion rate of 62%. The most common reasons for non-completion were victim refusals and relocations (moving without leaving any forwarding address). Follow-up interviews were completed with 13 of a possible 18 victims for a completion rate of 72%. Again, refusals and 'unable to contact' accounted for the non-completions. In an attempt to increase the number of potential interviewees, we contacted the Transition House to see if they would be willing to ask their clients (from Richmond) whether they would be willing to cooperate. Despite NOVA's willingness to help, we were not able to complete interviews with any of the clients they referred to us.

B. WITNESS INTERVIEWS

A survey questionnaire suitable for administration by telephone was developed to gather information on the experiences and perceptions of civilian Crown witnesses subpoenaed to appear in Provincial Court in Richmond. (A copy of this instrument is included in Volume II of this report.) The witnesses to be interviewed were identified from Court records of all cases involving Criminal Code offenses (other than impaired driving) completed in 1982.

The initial sample frame consisted of 198 witnesses. Of these, we were able to complete interviews with 90 for a completion rate of 45%. The majority of the non-completions were due to the 'age' of the files -- many of the addresses and phone numbers on the court files were no longer current. In view of the possibility that the witnesses interviewed constituted a biased sample from the 'population' of 198, we performed a number of comparison checks of representativeness. These tests indicated that the 90 witnesses interviewed were similar to

the total population in terms of offense types, trial outcomes and the nature of the witness' involvement in the offense (victim, third-party or employee of business victimized).

C. THE AGENCY INVENTORY

Experience in other Canadian cities, as well as in the U.S., has shown that some of the services needed by crime victims are routinely provided to other client populations by existing service agencies. Examples of such services are the provision of emergency financial aid to welfare recipients by provincial government agencies, and the provision of emergency transportation to handicapped individuals by volunteer agencies. On the other hand, some services of potential value to crime victims are unique to the circumstances of those victimized in particular ways. Others pertain only to individuals dealing with the police and the courts. For example, emergency home repair services might be needed by elderly break and enter victims while provision of case progress information could be important to victims of all types.

In order to develop a rational plan for victim services in Richmond we attempted to identify not only those services needed by crime victims, but also the extent to which such services are already being provided for other client populations in the area. To do this, we conducted telephone interviews with representatives of agencies providing relevant services to Richmond residents. (Exhibit II-1 provides a list of the agencies contacted.) The interviewees were asked about the types of services they provide, their client eligibility criteria, the extent to which they serve crime victims, the geographical coverage of their agencies, and a number of other questions (see list in Volume II). Following the telephone contacts, the agencies were sent copies of their descriptions for verification.

Exhibit II-1 List of agencies included in inventory

Aid to Victims of Crime (John Howard Society)
Chimo-Richmond Crisis Centre
Community Homemaker Service
Criminal Injuries Compensation Board
Emergency Social Services (M.H.R.)
Granny Y's Emergency Child Care Centre
Helpline for Children/Child Abuse Teams (M.H.R.)
Law Students Legal Advice Clinic
Mosaic
NOVA House/Richmond Transition House
Powell Place Sanctuary for Women
PRESERVE CANADA (Richmond Youth Services)
Richmond Association for Children's Services
Richmond Community Care Team
Richmond Community Information Centre
Richmond Family Day Care Society
Richmond Family Place (including Legal Advice Clinic)
Richmond Family Services
Richmond Kinsmen Homemaker Service
Richmond Ministerial Counselling Association
Richmond Volunteer Transportation Society
Richmond Youth Services
Salvation Army Family Services Centre
St. James Social Service
U.B.C. Legal Clinic
Vancouver Challenge Halfway House/Out-Reach Program and Teen Challenge
Vancouver Rape Relief
Vancouver Transition House
Victims of Violence

D. CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM INDICATORS

The victim surveys and, to some extent, the key official interviews were meant to address the question "What are the needs of crime victims?" Our measurement of certain criminal justice system indicators, however, reflects our interest in the broader question "What is the need for victim services?" The critical difference between these two questions is the inclusion in the latter of program impacts which effect not only the victim, but other individuals and agencies as well. For example, it may be that certain services will not only benefit victims directly, but will also increase the efficiency of the courts by increasing victim participation in the prosecution of suspects.

Of particular interest for this project was the inclusion of impacts which reflect the functioning of the criminal justice system. An often-expressed opinion is that when victims are treated "better" by the system (for example, by being offered victim services) they will co-operate more fully with the investigative and judicial processes. These in turn could produce higher clearance and conviction rates and increase police and court efficiency. To date, unfortunately, these opinions are more widely accepted than they are supported by empirical research. One of the few major demonstrations reported to date of a substantial system benefit associated with a victim assistance program comes from the New York Victim Services Agency. Included in this program is a police witness notification service which has produced tangible savings in police overtime previously spent in non-productive court attendance. The B.C. Witness Management System implemented in 1982 has also been shown to be cost-effective. A range of other potential benefits, while logically plausible, have yet to be demonstrated.

We included measurement of a number of indicators of system functioning in this study for two main reasons. Firstly, it was and is our belief that in these times of fiscal restraint, it is imperative to be able to document the cost-effectiveness of new programs. Measurement of these indicators prior to program implementation will provide the necessary baseline for future identifi-

cation of program impacts. Even if direct cost savings are not produced by whatever services are ultimately put in place, at least we should know the costs of these services as fully as possible. And if system efficiencies are achieved and documented, so much the better.

The second potential contribution to be made by the system functioning measures was in pointing to aspects of the way the system treats victims which could be improved. For example, knowing that victims' property is typically held as evidence for several months when a signed photograph would serve as well might suggest policy changes which would not only benefit victims directly, but also reduce the need for storage space and staff in detachment offices.

Exhibit II-2 presents the list of system indicators on which data were gathered along with the source and rationale for each measure.

E. INTERVIEWS WITH KEY OFFICIALS

Interviewees included police, court, and social service agency personnel. The characteristics which these people possessed in common relevant to the present project were knowledge of local conditions and resources, and an awareness of what might in the future limit the feasibility of new services. By approaching them for their ideas on potential changes in justice system procedures, and by informing them of our objectives and activities we hoped to maximize the cost-effectiveness and ensure the feasibility of the approaches to victim services recommended in our report prepared specifically for readers in Richmond.

Exhibit II-2 Criminal justice system indicators

Measure	Source	Rationale
Police Related		
1. Time spent by officers at scene of crime for selected crime types	Computer-assisted dispatch (CAD) records in case files	Various potential victim assistance initiatives could affect this measure in either direction. For example, providing officers with access to a mobile crisis counselling service could reduce the time spent by the officers calming distraught victims. On the other hand, increased emphasis on crisis intervention by the officers themselves, or even the time spent waiting for third party assistance could increase the average amount of time spent on the scene by the police. In either event, this information would be useful for assessing the costs of a range of possible programs.
2. Proportion of reported crimes cleared by charge	Detachment reports prepared monthly for Statistics Canada	The thinking here is that if victims receive more compassionate, responsive treatment from the system (meaning the police initially) then they will co-operate more fully with the investigation of the crime, the identification of suspects and the laying of charges. Logically, this should result in an increase in cases leading to charges for those victims who see themselves as having been treated well by the system.
3. Length of time victim property retained as evidence	Manual recording from exhibit log	Included among possible approaches which would benefit the victims by minimizing the length of time their property is held are: use of signed photographs as evidence in lieu of the actual object, and streamlining of the return system to ensure that the property owner is notified of its availability as soon as it is no longer needed in court.

Exhibit II-2 Criminal justice system indicators (continued)

Measure	Source	Rationale
4. Exploitation of home security survey	Crime prevention unit interviews	A possible component of a victim assistance program could be the active promotion of the detachment's home security survey service among residential break and enter victims. The proportion of those victims taking advantage of the service could be monitored prior to and after the start of the assistance programs. In the longer term, it would also be possible to monitor the revictimization rates of those taking preventive measures vs. those not taking such measures.
5. Frequency of call backs to same residence	Detachment alphabetical card files	A troublesome problem in many police jurisdictions is the chronic family violence situation (meaning wife-beating typically). It is conceivable that Richmond's assistance program may involve some new approaches to this problem such as more active encouragement of charging, or of referring battered women to needed support services. Such approaches would logically be expected to result in decreased numbers of repeat calls to these residences for these types of problems. Monitoring of the card files on a monthly basis should enable us to track any decreases in these calls once the program has begun.
Court Related		
6. Proportion of family violence cases in which charges laid by victim	Family court records (originally identified in occurrence reports)	Active encouragement of battered wives to charge their assailants could be a component of a victim assistance program. Such an effort should lead to an increase in the proportion of these cases in which charges are laid.

Exhibit II-2 Criminal justice system indicators (continued)

Measure	Source	Rationale
7. Proportion of cases in which charges are withdrawn by victim	Second victim survey	As with 2 above, any victim services which give the victim a sense of being well-treated by the system should logically improve the extent of victim co-operation in the system's functions, including prosecution. What we would be looking for in this measure would be a decrease in the proportion of cases in which the victims sought and achieved withdrawal of the charges. We would also want to note the stated reasons for the withdrawal.
8. Proportion of cases withdrawn due to victim non-attendance	Second victim survey	As per 7 above, except that here the victim simply failed to appear as required. In practice it may be difficult to distinguish cases falling under this category and those falling into 7.
9. Proportion of cases in which suspect convicted	Second victim survey and witness survey	As with 2, 7 and 8 above, victim services should logically improve victim co-operation with the judicial process leading ultimately to sounder evidence and improved prospects of conviction.
10. Proportion of convictions in which restorative sanctions imposed	Second victim survey and Adult Probation Records	A potential component of a victim assistance program could be the promotion of the use of restorative sanctions to benefit victims.
Other agencies		
11. Proportion of injured victims applying for compensation by CICB	Second victim survey	It appears that compensation at present is under-utilized by crime victims in Richmond. One potential assistance activity could be the encouragement of victims to apply and/or help in completing the required forms. This would be expected to increase the utilization of compensation by Richmond residents.

III

FINDINGS

In this chapter, we summarize the results of our data collection efforts, and discuss their implications. Separate sections are devoted to each of the 'populations' formally surveyed: general victims, wife assault victims and subpoenaed Crown witnesses. Relevant information from the agency inventory and from the informal interviews with criminal justice and social service personnel is interspersed throughout this chapter as appropriate.

In order to place the substance of this chapter in the proper context, the inherent limitations of the methodology employed in this study should be acknowledged. The major constraint on the generality of our findings derives from the fact that we only contacted individuals whose victimization was reported to the police. Victimization survey results based on random sampling of households indicate that (across crime types) something less than half of all crimes are ever reported to the police. By starting from police records, the present study has excluded 'non-reporters' from the survey samples. The other major feature of our methodology which limits the breadth of the findings concerns the highly structured nature of the survey instruments. The major advantages of a structured approach are the consistency and reliability of the results it produces. The major drawback is that it does not allow for extensive probing by the interviewers, and does not permit the interviewees to express all of their thoughts and feelings about the incident in an open-ended manner. Data acquired through unstructured interviews, while 'in-depth' and 'colourful' are difficult to collate into general patterns and findings. On balance, the structured approach adopted for this study has served its purpose well. Finally, readers are reminded that no interviews were conducted with any victims younger than 16 years of age. Consequently, this study can provide no information on children as victims of crime.

A. GENERAL VICTIMS

Overall, the general surveys conducted for this report do not indicate that the current procedures and services of the criminal justice and social service systems in Richmond are leaving important needs of crime victims unmet. This view is supported by the victims interviewed, 95% of whom reported that they would be willing to report (similar) crimes to the police in the future, while 97% stated that they would encourage a friend or family member to report to the police if they were victimized. These responses clearly reflect a positive orientation by Richmond's crime victims towards (in particular) the police. At the same time, a number of areas of potential improvement were identified in the course of the research.

In order to present the data collected for this study in digestible 'chunks', we have organized it into several categories. These categories are based on the nature of the impacts/needs/services discussed. The survey and related data on general victims is presented below under the headings of: financial needs, emotional needs, practical needs, information needs and secondary needs.

1. Financial needs

The surveys of general crime victims produced data on two distinct types of financial impacts of victimization. The first and most often reported concerned costs resulting from property loss and damage crimes. Of the 227 victims interviewed in the first survey, 116 (51%) reported loss of at least one item of personal property. Of these reported thefts, only 7% involved any type of threat or attack. Cash was taken relatively infrequently (11% of all reported thefts). The items most commonly reported stolen were motor vehicle parts and accessories, bicycles, and other items of personal property. The reported average values of these losses were, for each type of item: cash ($10), motor vehicle parts and accessories ($249), bicycles ($75), and other personal property ($73). These averages should be interpreted with caution as, in some cases, they are based on relatively few observations.

Property damage was reported by 81 of the 227 (36%) respondents to the first survey. Of these cases, 77% involved damage to motor vehicles and 20% involved damage to the dwellings or other property of the victims. The average value of damage reported in the second survey was $430.

The victims of loss and damage offenses reported extensive reliance on both their own resources and insurance to recover from the financial effects of their victimization. Of the 72% of loss victims who reported having insurance before the crime, 65% filed an insurance claim and, of these, 94% were successful. On the other hand, 28% of the loss victims did not have insurance coverage before the theft. Finally, some or all of the stolen money or property was recovered by approximately 14% of the loss victims. The costs arising from property damage crimes were paid for with equal frequency by both the individual victimized and under the terms of the individual's insurance policy.

The importance of insurance as a means of recovering losses resulting from property crime was apparent in the responses to our surveys. A somewhat surprising finding (noted above) was that 28% of the loss victims did not have insurance coverage before their theft. If these individuals were not insured because of financial hardship, then the impact of their losses would be especially severe. In order to examine this hypothesis, an analysis was performed to determine whether or not there was any relationship (in our sample) between being insured and family income. The results of this analysis showed no relationship between coverage and income. It should be noted, however, that Richmond is a predominantly middle to upper-middle class suburban community with relatively few low-income families. Hence, our failure to find a relationship between income and insurance coverage in Richmond may not be generalizable to communities with wider ranges of incomes among their residents.

In terms of expressed needs for services, only 6% of the respondents to the first survey reported a need for emergency financial aid.* These people were predominantly victims of property loss/damage crimes. On the six-month follow-up survey, a substantial 29% of the victims interviewed reported a need for compensation for stolen/damaged property. Of those reporting this need, 79% were able to obtain at least partial compensation, typically through their insurance coverage.

Emergency financial aid is available to individuals and families in crisis through the Emergency Social Services operated by the Ministry of Human Resources. Eligibility for aid depends on individual circumstances (including financial). Compensation for property losses on a non-emergency basis is provided through two sources: insurance and restitution. Insurance is a private matter and was discussed above. Restitution in Richmond can be requested by loss/damage victims as part of the sentences of convicted offenders. Our survey results indicated considerable support for the concept of restitution among the victims surveyed. On the first survey, 39% of the threat/attack victims and 71% of loss/damage victims indicated that they would be in favour of the offender making direct compensation or retribution to them for their losses. On the second survey, the proportions in favour of direct restitution/compensation increased to 76% overall.

---

* In analyzing and interpreting victims' expressions of need for any type of service, it is important to recognize that the extent to which such needs are reported will be limited by the perceived extent to which relevant services are seen as available or even possible. At the same time, such expressions of need cannot be translated directly into service demand levels. It may be that an individual would report a need for emergency financial aid but would not be willing to take the necessary steps to apply for it.

A recent initiative in Richmond was the start-up of Project RESTORE/C.A.R.E. (Crime Activities Reparation Effort) by the South Fraser Regional Justice Manager's Group. The major objective of this effort is to help victims receive 'due reparation ..... where there is an identified offender.' As it currently operates in Richmond, Project RESTORE involves the distribution by the R.C.M.P. members (at the crime scene) to the victim of a 'Victim Booklet.' These booklets are to be distributed to all non-commercial loss/damage victims and all injured victims. Included in this pamphlet are information on: reparation, Criminal Court procedures, Civil Court alternatives, the Criminal Injuries Compensation Act and the John Howard Society's Aid to Victims of Crime Program (offering counselling and referral services). As well, the pamphlet includes a tear-out sheet on which the victims can list items stolen and/or damaged and associated costs of replacement and repairs. This sheet is then sent to the R.C.M.P. where it is included in the file on the incident. If a suspect is apprehended, this sheet is attached to the 'Report to Crown Counsel' and is used in proceedings to seek restitution (if requested by the victim). Importantly, Project RESTORE was designed mainly for cases in which the offender has been identified and tried successfully (a small subset of all crimes). It is too early yet to know whether RESTORE will achieve its objectives of increasing the use of restorative sanctions. Hopefully, the agencies involved in the program will gather sufficient data on both its operations and impacts to measure the effectiveness of the program.

The second type of financial need examined in this study concerned the costs associated with victimization-related injuries. Only 8% of the victims interviewed in the first survey reported any injury as a result of their victimization. The most frequently reported types of injuries were bruises, scratches and cuts, and three victims reported broken bones and dislodged teeth. Of the 18 individuals injured, seven (38%) required medical treatment. In all but one of these cases, the treatment was administered in the hospital emergency department and did not require an overnight hospital stay. These figures are consistent with the data gathered by the Greater Vancouver Victimization Survey (G.V.V.S.) indicating that 25% of victims of 'personal' crimes were injured, of whom 39% required medical attention.

Of the 18 individuals who reported an injury in the first survey, we were able to contact 12 to complete the second survey. Of these, two reported enquiring about their eligibility as a crime victim to receive compensation. One individual was told that he could be eligible to receive compensation from the Criminal Injuries Compensation Board where he subsequently applied and had his claim accepted. This individual reported that the award did not fully cover his expenses, including medical and ambulance costs, and loss of wages.

Some impairment of their ability to carry out their normal activities was reported by 7 of the 12 injured victims interviewed. In all but one of these cases, the impairment was temporary. In the cases of two of these individuals, their impairment resulted in financial losses for which they were not compensated.

Although the incidence of serious injury is low (only seven of the victims interviewed, or 3%, required any medical treatment), the implications of such injuries could be severe, e.g. loss of wages, pain and suffering, or even permanent disability. Claims for such losses can be made to the Criminal Injuries Compensation Board which may, after investigation of the claim, award compensation to the victim (or to the victim's guardian or survivor, depending on the circumstances). The study findings indicate that roughly two-thirds of the threat/attack victims were unaware of the existence of this program. Our police interviews also indicated that awareness among the officers of available services (in general) was low. Clearly if neither the police nor the victims they deal with are familiar with the range of services available, these services will not be utilized to the extent that they could (and should) be.

Our perception that the services of the Criminal Injuries Compensation Board are underutilized by Richmond residents is supported by statistics published by the Board. For example, in 1980 the C.I.C.B. received only 18 applications for compensation from Richmond residents versus 315 such applications from Vancouver residents. (In Vancouver, the police inform injured victims about the C.I.C.B.) These figures are dramatically disproportionate to the

difference in the total populations of Richmond and Vancouver (approximately in a ratio of 1 to 6). It may be that in future, more Richmond residents will contact the Board since its description and telephone number are included in the RESTORE pamphlet. Whether or not this mechanism will be sufficient to overcome the apparent lack of information on this agency among crime victims in Richmond remains to be seen. In any event, it is clear that some effort is needed to promote awareness of the purposes and procedures of the C.I.C.B. among police officers as well as among injured victims. In the case of Richmond in particular, it is ironic that the C.I.C.B. offices are located only a few blocks from the R.C.M.P. Detachment. Despite this proximity, however, there still exists a considerable knowledge gap among the R.C.M.P. officers concerning the Board and what it can do to help injured crime victims.

2. Emotional needs

An extensive research literature has developed which examines the emotional impacts of crime on victims. In large part, this literature focusses on more serious (meaning violent) crime types, although some research has also looked at the emotional impacts of residential break and enter (e.g. Waller and Okihiro, 1978).

The Richmond surveys of general crime victims included a number of questions intended to identify the emotional reactions of the victims surveyed to their victimization. The set of questions asked employed both open-ended (volunteered response) and prompted formats. Exhibits III-1 and III-2 summarize the responses to these questions from the immediate and long-term surveys, respectively. These tables present summary data for all of the victims surveyed. Comparisons were performed both by crime type (loss/damage vs. threat/attack) and sex of victim. Almost across the board, female threat/attack victims reported the strongest emotional reactions followed by, in general, male threat/attack victims. The predominant emotional reaction to the reported crimes on both surveys was anger (78% and 47% on the first and second surveys, respectively) followed by various expressions of nervousness or fear (38% and 23%). Only 7% of the victims interviewed reported no emotional reaction whatsoever.

Exhibit III-1 Emotional reactions reported on first survey

Reactions immediately following crime	
Volunteered Responses	Per cent Reporting Response
Anger	24%
Upset/shaken	14%
Disbelief	9%
Frightened	13%
Non-emotional responses	33%
No reaction	7%
Prompted Responses	
Nervousness	38%
Crying and shaking	20%
Angry	78%
Confused	23%
Physically sick	5%
Reactions one week or so after crime	
Prompted Responses (only)	
Nervousness	21%
Crying or shaking	4%
Fear of being alone	14%
Fear of entering home	15%
Fear of going out at night	15%
Anger	50%
Memory loss	1%
Confusion/shock	1%
Sickness/nausea	.5%
Trouble sleeping	.5%
Headaches	7%
Lack of appetite	6%

Exhibit III-2 Emotional reactions reported on follow-up survey

Prompted Responses (only)	Per cent Reporting Response
Nervousness	23%
Crying or shaking	1%
Fear of being alone	12%
Fear of entering home	15%
Anger	47%
Memory loss	2%
Confusion or state of shock	4%
Physical sickness or nausea	2%
Trouble sleeping	10%
Headaches	2%
Lack of appetite	2%

In terms of expressed needs for services to help with their emotional reactions, many victims indicated a need for 'someone to talk to' about what happened. On the first survey, 24% of the victims surveyed reported that they felt a need for this kind of help immediately after the police left. As well, 13% reported a need for someone to stay with them for security or to 'keep them company.' Of the victims expressing these needs, 93% and 87% respectively were able to obtain the required help from their families and friends.

On the follow-up survey, only 2% of the victims interviewed reported a need for counselling. Two-thirds of these people indicated that they were able to get needed help from their families and friends. It seems clear from this that the majority of Richmond's crime victims are able to rely on their personal resources for help in dealing with the emotional impacts of their victimization. A minority do not have (or choose not to use) these resources, however. Before describing the services available to these people, we briefly examine some data gathered on victims' reported feelings of security following their victimizations.

Respondents to both the first and second surveys were asked to indicate whether or not each of a set of questions about anxiety and fear applied to them. Exhibit III-3 summarizes the results of these questions. One surprising

Exhibit III-3 Reported feelings of insecurity and fear (both surveys)

Statement	Percentage of first survey respondents who indicated that statement applied to them	Percentage of second survey respondents who indicated that statement applied to them
Since the incident I feel generally less secure	37*	35**
Since the incident I feel that the streets of my neighbourhood are less safe	52*	46*
Since the incident I feel that my home is one place where I feel completely safe	54	54
Since the incident I have now become more anxious in public places	29	33
Since the incident I am now more suspicious of strangers	58	63***
Since the incident I am now afraid to be alone	13*	5
Since the incident, I am afraid to enter my home alone	14*	9
Since the incident I am afraid to go out at night	14*	17***

* Considerably higher for females than males, especially among threat/attack victims.

** Highest for male threat/attack victims.

*** Highest for female loss/damage victims.

feature of this Exhibit is the consistency between the responses to the first and second surveys. Allowing for sampling fluctuations, there appears to be very little change in the answers to these items over the six-month period between the surveys. In general, the data indicated that female victims reported considerably more fear and anxiety than did male victims, especially in cases involving threat/attack crimes. Since we have no pre-crime baseline measures of these feelings, it is impossible to assess the extent to which the crime is affecting the response to these questions. It may be that some of the respondents would have responded as they did even if they had not be victimized. The stability of the answers over the six-month period does, however, suggest that these attitudes are not transitory and may be difficult to change. The extensive reported use of crime prevention techniques (discussed below) may also reflect the reliability of these attitude measures.

Counselling services are currently provided to Richmond residents by a range of agencies. Some of these agencies have traditionally dealt with specific client groups, e.g. victims of sexual assault, while others offer a general service. Included in the six agencies identified as offering emergency (24-hour availability) counselling and the nine offering non-emergency counselling are both professional (paid) and volunteer services. For the most part, these agencies do not view crime victims as comprising large proportions of their client loads.

In view of the relatively low expressed demand for emotional support and counselling from outside the victims' own networks of family and friends, it would seem reasonable to expect that most unmet needs for such help could be met by some of the agencies already providing counselling services. To accomplish this would require several steps. First, willing agencies would have to be identified and recruited. Next, the police would have to become aware of the existence of these services. Finally, a referral network including the police would have to be established to channel victims seeking help to the appropriate agency.

3. Practical needs

Certain types of crimes will generate needs for help with practical matters on the part of some victims. For example, victims of residential break and enter may require the services of a locksmith outside of regular business hours. Victims of vandalism or theft may not be aware of the procedure for reporting their losses to their insurance agents, or of reporting stolen credit cards. Some injured victims will require transportation to hospital, and may not be aware of the availability of, or application procedures for injuries compensation. Finally, property crime victims whose cases go to court may not be aware of the potential for seeking restitution from the convicted offender.

Our survey of general crime victims in Richmond assessed the need for such practical services in two ways. Firstly, the survey directly questioned the victims on their perceived need for various services. The results indicated that only 1% of the victims expressed a need for emergency home repairs, 2% needed emergency transportation to hospital and 1% needed compensation for medical costs. In contrast with these relatively limited expressions of need, 23% of the victims indicated a need for advice on practical matters and 29% expressed a need for compensation for stolen property (including via restitution).

As was the case with financial and emotional needs, the data on practical needs suggest that what is required by most victims is more information. There is a 24-hour locksmith service available to Richmond residents but the R.C.M.P. officers may not be aware of it. The procedures involved in filing insurance claims and reporting stolen credit cards are straightforward. Police officers should be familiar with these procedures and should ensure that victims requiring information of this type get the help they need. Again, our data from both the victim surveys and the interviews with police officers revealed a low level of awareness of the Criminal Injuries Compensation Board. Finally, victims of property crimes expressed support for the concept of restitution (76% in favour on second survey). But eligible victims may not know of their right to seek restitution, or of how to go about doing it. Project RESTORE represents an attempt to fill this information gap.

A distinct area of practical need is that of crime prevention information. On the first survey, 19% of the victims reported a need for more crime prevention information. When questioned as to whether the attending officer had provided them with crime prevention advice, only 44% of the victims interviewed replied affirmatively. Even so, despite their frequent statements that the police did not provide them with crime prevention information, reported use by the victims of crime prevention measures following their victimization was extensive. Among the most often followed approaches were: locking doors/windows (65%); installing new locks/window bars (28%); leaving lights on when out (41%); protecting car (44%); having home checked while away (44%); and putting possessions in a safer place (53%). Clearly, these people are prepared to take various steps to prevent future victimization. Even limited input from the attending officer, or a suggestion that the victim contact the Crime Prevention Unit would likely satisfy those seeking more information. It may also be possible to recruit victims to assist the Crime Prevention Unit by contacting their neighbours to promote crime prevention.

4. Information needs

As part of the present study, an inventory of agencies providing services of potential value to crime victims in Richmond was compiled. Exhibit III-4 presents a listing of the agencies contacted, and the types of services they provide. It is apparent from this Exhibit that an extensive array of services are available in Richmond (or at least available to Richmond residents). It is equally clear from our victim surveys and agency interviews that the level of awareness of these services is low, even within the social service community itself. With respect to the police, only 24% of the victims were informed of available services by the officer who responded to their call.

In general terms, these findings point to a need for improved access to information on available services for victims. The victim interviews indicate that demand for services other than various types of information, immediate emotional support (generally received from family and/or friends) and compensation for losses is limited to a small minority of victims. The fact that these people may be few in number does not mean that their needs should be ignored.

Exhibit III-4 **Agencies providing services relevant to the needs of crime victims in Richmond**

Type of Service	Agency	Major client base	Currently serves any crime victims?
Emergency			
Child Care & Protection	- Granny Y's Emergency Child Care Centre	children aged 3 mths to 5 yrs	few
	- MHR Helpline for Children & Child Abuse Teams	abused children	yes
	- Richmond Association for Children's Services	runaways and disturbed children	yes
	- Richmond Family Day Care Society	children needing emergency day care	few
	- Richmond Kinsmen Homemaker Service	seniors, some families	no
Counselling	- Chimo-Richmond Crisis Centre	individuals in crisis	no
	- Richmond Community Care Team	people with psychiatric problems	yes
	- Richmond Ministerial Counselling Assoc.	anyone in distress	not known
	- Salvation Army Family Services Centre	families and single women	yes
	- Vancouver Challenge Outreach/Halfway House and Teen Challenge	anyone over 17 years of age	no
	- Vancouver Rape Relief	female victims of sexual abuse	yes

Exhibit III-4 **Agencies providing services relevant to the needs of crime victims in Richmond** (Continued)

Type of Service	Agency	Major client base	Currently serves any crime victims?
Accommodation	- Chimo-Richmond Crisis Centre	individuals in crisis	no
	- NOVA House/Richmond Transition House	battered women & their children	yes
	- Powell Place Sanctuary for Women	women in emergency situations	yes
	- Richmond Association for Children's Services	runaways, and other children needing shelter	yes
	- Salvation Army Family Services Centre	families and single women	yes
	- Vancouver Challenge Halfway House	individuals aged 17 & 35 years	no
	- Vancouver Rape Relief	female victims of sexual abuse	yes
	- Vancouver Transition House	battered women & their children	yes
Financial Aid	- MHR Emergency Social Services	individuals and families in crisis	few
Intepretation/ Translation	- Mosaic	not specified	yes
Clothing/Food/ Household Goods	- Salvation Army Family Services Centre	families and single women	yes
	- St. James Social Service	not specified	yes

Exhibit III-4 **Agencies providing services relevant to the needs of crime victims in Richmond** (Continued)

Type of Service	Agency	Major client base	Currently serves any crime victims?
Homemaking	- Community Homemaker Service	families in crisis and the handicapped	no
	- MHR Emergency Social Services	individuals and families in crisis	few
	- Richmond Kinsmen Homemaker Service	families in crisis, senior, the handicapped & those with temporary medical problems	no
Non-Emergency			
Counselling	- Chimo-Richmond Crisis Centre	individuals in crisis	no
	- Richmond Community Care Team	people with psychiatric problems	yes
	- Richmond Family Place	parents and children	not known
	- Richmond Family Services	families	not known
	- Richmond Ministerial Counselling Assoc.	anyone in distress	not known
	- Richmond Youth Services	teenagers 'at risk', & needing job counselling	no
	- Vancouver Challenge Halfway House/Outreach	anyone 18-35 yrs of age	no

Exhibit III-4 **Agencies providing services relevant to the needs of crime victims in Richmond** (Continued)

Type of Service	Agency	Major client base	Currently serves any crime victims?
Counselling (Cont'd)	- Vancouver Rape Relief	female victims of sexual abuse	yes
	- Victims of Violence	victims of crime & their friends & relatives	yes
Accommodation	- Richmond Association for Children's Services	runaways & other children needing shelter	yes
	- Richmond Ministerial Counselling Assoc.	anyone in distress	not known
	- Vancouver Challenge Halfway House	anyone over 17 years of age	no
Legal Advice	- Law Students Legal Advice Clinic	those with small claims & landlord-tenant problems	few
	- Richmond Family Place Legal Advice Clinic	as above	no
	- UBC Legal Clinic	low income individuals	few
Referral/ Information	- Aid to Victims of Crime	crime victims	yes
	- Chimo-Richmond Crisis Centre	individuals in crisis	no
	- Restore/C.A.R.E.	crime victims whose cases have led to a conviction	yes

Exhibit III-4 **Agencies providing services relevant to the needs of crime victims in Richmond** (Continued)

Type of Service	Agency	Major client base	Currently serves any crime victims?
Referral/ Information (Cont'd)	- Richmond Community Information Centre	not specified	not known
	- Richmond Family Day Care Society	individuals seeking day care services	no
	- Richmond Family Place	parents and children	not known
	- Vancouver Rape Relief	female victims of sexual abuse	yes
Transportation	- Richmond Volunteer Transportation Society	people unable to use regular public transit due to age, illness or handicap	no
Home Repair	- 'Preserve Canada' (Richmond Youth Services)	seniors, the handicapped & those on low incomes (available only in the summer)	no
Financial/ Compensation/ Restitution	- Criminal Injuries Compensation Board	individuals suffering financial loss due to injury resulting from criminal victimization	yes
	- Restore/C.A.R.E.	crime victims whose cases have led to to a conviction	yes

It does mean, however, that their needs will likely not justify the establishment of new service agencies. The fact that existing agencies are already providing the needed types of services to other client populations argues for improved inter-agency coordination and referral of crime victims among these agencies.

The most efficient means of achieving this objective of meeting at least a subset of victim needs through existing service structures would involve (minimally) the following steps:

- Existing agencies which do or could provide services to victims will have to be contacted and recruited to participate in a coordinating committee. The purpose of this committee would be to establish community priorities with respect to the type of services to be provided to victims, and then to identify the agencies which will deliver these services.

- Information on availability of services, and the specific procedures for requesting services will have to be made available to the police, and to the participating agencies. In this way, victims eligible for, and in need of specific services will be informed as to where and how to seek the help they need. The optimal means of making this information available is not immediately obvious. Alternatives include the establishment of a single centralized referral resource which could be contacted by anyone seeking information (i.e. victims, police or agency staff); or the information could be compiled into a concise reference document which would be distributed to both relevant agencies and to police officers. There are undoubtedly other means of accomplishing the objective of providing information to victims on available services. Each will have its advantages and disadvantages. Experience in other jurisdictions may be helpful in selecting the best strategy for Richmond. In any event, the final choice will rest with local police and social service agency representatives.

5. Secondary needs

For the purposes of this report, the term 'secondary needs' refers to impacts and associated victim needs arising from the way in which the criminal justice system deals with crime victims. In this chapter, we examine victim perceptions of the way in which the police respond to their needs and identify aspects of police handling of victims which could be improved. Later sections of this report look at the particular problems faced by wife assault victims, and by subpoenaed Crown witnesses in their contact with the courts.

For many crime victims, the only 'agent' of the justice system with whom they will have any contact will be the police officer attending their call. Due to the relatively low rate of case solution (charges laid) for many crime types, most victims will not be involved in a trial. For this reason, it is especially important that the contact between the victims and the responding police officer be as reinforcing and positive for the victims as circumstances will permit. Among the victims surveyed for this study, the overall level of satisfaction with the police response to their victimization was high. This was somewhat more the case for threat/attack victims than for loss/damage victims. Otherwise, only a fairly consistent 20-25% of the victims interviewed in both surveys reported that they were not satisfied. In terms of their response to specific aspects of their contact with the police, the victims interviewed believed that the police: responded quickly (67% of those expressing an opinion), were polite and courteous (90%), were sympathetic to their situations (81%), did all they could to locate and arrest the criminal involved (57% - many said they didn't know), kept them informed of case progress (30%), informed them of available services (24%), and provided crime prevention information (44%). In many of these categories, the victims replied that they 'did not know', for example, whether they had been kept informed (19% of all respondents). This may reflect a lack of specific expectations on the part of most of the victims interviewed as to what a reasonable or normal level of police service is.

The issues of providing information on available services and on crime prevention have been discussed in earlier sections of this report. One important topic which has not as yet been examined concerns the provision of information on case progress. Current police policy calls for all victims to be contacted at some point regarding their cases. As a practical matter, however, this does not always occur: the officers do not have time to contact everyone, and some matters are so minor that they do not warrant (either from the police or the victim's perspective) any further communication. It should be possible, however, for those victims who desire more information to get it. At present, victims who are injured and/or lose property are given a RESTORE pamphlet which includes a space to record the Occurrence Number of the offense. Theoretically, the police will contact the victim later if a suspect is apprehended. Victims are encouraged not to contact the police themselves. One way to streamline and improve the communication of case progress information would be to provide all victims with a card on which the Occurrence Number is recorded by the attending officer. Victims who wished to do so could then contact the Detachment and request an update on their case using the Occurrence Number to identify both themselves and the case. Data on the Police Information Retrieval System (P.I.R.S.) would then be accessed, and the victim's questions would either be answered directly or passed on to the member involved. This does not mean that no proactive contacts with identified victims should be made by the police. Clearly, in cases where the file is either 'concluded to Court' or 'concluded to file', the victims (if any) should be informed as promptly as possible. The only exception to this would be cases of property loss/damage reported for 'information or insurance purposes' only.

Another aspect of police procedures which directly affects some victims concerns the retention of victims' property as evidence. Of the property loss victims interviewed, one in seven (14%) reported that at least some of their property was recovered. In some cases, this property was held by the police as evidence. Examination of detachment records indicated that the average length of time that property is held is approximately four months. An alternative to holding the property is available: subject to the approval of the Crown

Prosecutor, a photograph of the items can be taken and signed by the item's owner. He is then permitted to take the item home, and the photograph is used in court instead of the item itself. Hence the owner does not have to wait until the trial concludes to recover his property. The present practice in Richmond is only to provide this service at the expressed request of the owner -- it is not offered as a matter of course. We believe that the practice of photographing recovered property should be employed in all applicable cases where the ownership of the item is clear, and where the photograph will serve adequately as evidence. This seems a simple and straightforward means of minimizing one aspect of the inconvenience to victims associated with their participation in the justice process.

6. Comparison with other studies

Research studies into the needs of crime victims have also been performed in other cities, including Winnipeg, Calgary, Kitchener-Waterloo and Ottawa. In this section of our report, the main findings from Richmond are compared with those from these other sites. Our aim here is not draw detailed conclusions about the similarities and differences observed in these various studies. Instead, we seek only to provide a general context in which to examine the Richmond data. Clearly, detailed comparisons would not be appropriate given the inter-study differences in research design, survey instruments, and victim sample composition, as well as differences between the cities themselves (Richmond being a relatively uniformly middle-class suburban community). The organization of this section parallels the format used above to present the Richmond results.

- **Financial needs.** Expressions of need for financial aid were reported by a fairly consistent 3%-6% of the victims interviewed in the studies conducted in Richmond (6%), Winnipeg (3%), Calgary (3%), Kitchener-Waterloo (4.5%). The Ottawa study did not provide comparable data on this question.

- **Emotional needs.** The composition of the samples of victims interviewed in the five locations varied widely in terms of the types of crimes represented. As a result, the reported emotional responses also vary substantially. In Richmond, the predominant emotional reactions were anger and nervousness/ fear. In the other sites, frequent mentions were fears of various kinds, increases in suspicion and feelings of personal invasion. The Richmond data indicated that 24% of the victims interviewed needed 'someone to talk to about what happened.' This compares with reported percentages of 26%-47% from the other sites. Most of the studies indicated that many victims were able to seek help with their emotional reactions from family members and friends.

- **Practical needs.** The Richmond data indicated that the only practical assistance required by sizable numbers of victims relates to greater access to information on such matters as filing insurance claims (23%), seeking compensation for stolen property (29%) and crime prevention procedures (19%). The Calgary data indicated comparable needs for practical advice (19% of respondents), compensation information (20%), and crime prevention information (19%). For Kitchener-Waterloo, comparable data for advice on procedures, compensation information and security information were 13%, 20% and 30% respectively.

- **Information needs.** The type of information (not related to the police or courts) most needed by the victims interviewed in Richmond was concerned with the types of help available from local agencies. This was also the case in Calgary where 19% of the survey respondents reported a need for 'advice on available help.' The other sites did not provide comparable data.

- **Secondary needs.** As discussed above, secondary needs refer for the most part to needs arising from the victims' contacts with the police. In all of the studies where this area was examined, the victims expressed general satisfaction with the services provided by the police (70%-80%). At the same time, needs were consistently reported for: more information on case progress, more information on crime prevention measures, and more information on help available from other agencies.

Overall, the Richmond results are generally consistent with those from the other locations studied. The predominant needs identified are those of providing more information to victims, including information on criminal justice system procedures and activities, and on help available from social service agencies.

B. VICTIMS OF WIFE ASSAULT

Among the most controversial problems faced by the criminal justice system over the past several years has been that of how to deal with wife assault. In a report on wife battering published in May of 1982, the Commons Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs recommended changes in such diverse areas as: police training, funding for emergency shelters, legal administration treatment programs for batterers, and public education. In order to place the findings of the present study with respect to wife assault in context, the manner in which the needs of these people differ from the needs of other crime victims will first be highlighted.

The traditional distinction between wife assault and other types of crime is based on the view that wife assault is not a criminal matter. Rather, it is a private family matter which is best left to the family to resolve. Wife assault has not traditionally been seen as a problem requiring, or even suitable for

intervention by the criminal justice system. One result of this has been the relative public invisibility of the problem -- because it is a 'private matter', it does not come to the attention of those outside the family.

In addition to often not being perceived and treated as victims of crime, assaulted wives differ from victims of other types of crime in that they:

- are often subject to repeated and ongoing victimizations by their assailants;
- may require shelter and/or protection outside of their family homes;
- may require long-term financial assistance to support themselves and their children (if any);
- often want treatment rather than punishment for their assailants, thus complicating the interaction between the victim and the justice system;
- may choose to maintain an ongoing, intimate relationship with their assailants despite their assailant's abusive behaviour.

A final distinction between assaulted wives and other types of victims is the possible effects of this crime on the children in the family. They may be abused themselves, and they may come to see violence as a normal part of family life which they may perpetuate as adults.

One additional aspect of our current understanding of wife assault which often sparks controversy is the lack of valid and reliable estimates of the incidence of this crime. The estimates range from one woman (married or in a live-in relationship) in ten over the course of a year (McLeod, 1980) to the seven per thousand figure derived from the recent National Urban Victimization Survey. Even allowing for differences in both counting methods and definitions, these two estimates are difficult, if not impossible, to reconcile.

It is against this background of uncertainty as to the number of cases we should expect 'out there' that our findings are presented. In fact, one of the most (to us) surprising outcomes of our attempts to locate and interview 25 victims of wife assault was the low frequency with which these incidents were appearing on the dispatch records. In general, cases were being identified at a rate of one per week (from police records). If one accepts the 'one in ten' estimate, then our finding is not credible -- either we were missing cases at some point, or they were not being reported to the R.C.M.P. On the basis of the 'seven per thousand' estimate, however, our finding is quite believable. Assuming that there are 30,000 'wives' (broadly defined) in Richmond, then the expected number of wife assault victims over a year would be approximately 200, or 16 per month. Since the reporting rate for these cases is generally accepted to be very low, then our finding of 4 per month does not seem unreasonable. This apparently low rate of occurrence of wife assault in Richmond is also partially corroborated by two other pieces of information: firstly, only five wife assault cases were tried in Richmond Family Court in all of 1982, and, at the time our survey started, the Richmond Transition House was providing shelter for only three victims with their children, not all of whom were Richmond residents (although other individuals were referred and had to be turned away due to lack of space).

In view of this uncertainty regarding numbers of reported cases, it would be useful to develop a procedure for identifying and counting wife assaults in Richmond. One possible method for doing this would be to have the officers on patrol record (on the Occurrence Report) the nature of the relationship between the 'combatants' in all domestic or family dispute cases. In coding these cases for input into the Operational System of Reporting (O.S.R.), the readers could flag these cases by assigning them a unique numerical code. (Each detachment has several codes available for local use.) P.I.R.S. could then be used on a periodic basis to retrieve and count these cases. Obviously, many details would have to be worked out before such a system could be implemented (e.g. definitions and coding rules). There may also be alternative methods of achieving the same results. In any case, the benefits of providing better data on

the incidence of wife assault should justify the marginal costs of case identification and counting by the police.

In the remainder of this section of our report, we present and discuss the findings of our surveys of wife assault victims. As was the case with victims of general crime, the data on wife assault will be presented under the headings of financial needs, emotional needs, practical needs, information needs and secondary needs.

1. Financial needs

The financial needs of wife assault victims typically arise from the fact that many of these people are economically dependent on their assailants. The extent of this dependence will vary with the number (and ages) of children in the household, and with the woman's individual resources (both financial and in terms of her employability). The importance of this dependence derives from the fact that some wife assault victims may believe that they can't afford (financially) to leave their assailant (whose income is supporting the family). Among the wife assault victims who completed the first survey, four (22%) reported a need for emergency financial assistance. All of these (four) women were living with their assailants at the time of the reported incident, and all had children living with them. (Overall, 45% of the first survey respondents were not living with their assailants at the time of the incident.)

Emergency financial assistance as well as longer-term income assistance (welfare) are available to qualified applicants from the Ministry of Human Resources. While help of this type may be very important in the short run, welfare is likely not the optimum long-run solution to the financial problems faced by wife assault victims who leave their assailants. More appropriate strategies may include stricter enforcement of maintenance orders for child support, interventions which provide the women with exclusive use of the family dwelling and the development of programs to train (or re-train) wife assault victims (among others) for successful participation in the job market. Clearly,

this latter approach in particular cannot be pursued overnight, or in isolation from the current high level of general unemployment. But any reasonable approach aimed at increasing the self-sufficiency of wife assault victims would seem preferable to leaving these individuals with no alternatives beyond staying with their assailants or becoming dependent upon public assistance.

2. Emotional needs

The incidents reported to the police by the wife assault victims interviewed for this study involved both verbal and physical abuse. Of the victims completing the first survey, ten (55%) reported that they were only threatened verbally while the remaining eight (45%) were either punched, kicked or slapped. The victims of physical attack required medical attention in 37% (three of eight) of the cases interviewed, all of whom required emergency treatment only (no overnight stays in hospital).

As might be expected, the varying nature of the reported incidents produced a range of emotional responses in the victims. Exhibit III-5 presents a summary of both the volunteered and prompted responses to questions about emotional reactions on both the first and second surveys. It is apparent from these data that for most of the victims interviewed, the incident was quite traumatic. This is particularly evident in the prompted responses to questions about their reactions immediately following the assaults: 89% 'nervous' and 'crying and shaking', 83% 'angry' and 'afraid for own safety.' Questions regarding longer-term reactions indicate that for most of the victims interviewed, the emotional impacts of the reported incidents diminished with the passage of several months (or less).

The traumatic nature of most of the reported incidents resulted in expressions of need for 'someone to talk to for awhile after the police left' and 'someone to stay with you to provide company/security' (56% of first survey respondents for both items). An encouraging finding of the first survey was that 15 (83%) of the victims were able to talk about the incident with a friend or

Exhibit III-5 Emotional reactions reported by wife assault victims

REACTIONS IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING ASSAULT

	Number (Per cent) Reporting Response
Volunteered Responses	
Scared/terrified	5 (28%)
Very angry	4 (22%)
Afraid he would come back	1 (6%)
Very upset/shaking/crying	5 (28%)
Embarrassed - no need for police	1 (6%)
Prompted Responses	
Nervous	16 (89%)
Crying or shaking	16 (89%)
Angry	15 (83%)
Afraid for own safety	15 (83%)
Afraid for children's safety	10 (50%)
Confused or in a state of shock	12 (67%)
Physically sick or nauseous	7 (39%)
Reactions One Week or so After Assault	
Nervous	8 (44%)
Crying or shaking	7 (39%)
Afraid of being alone	8 (44%)
Afraid of entering own home	4 (22%)
Afraid of going out at night	8 (44%)
Angry	10 (50%)
Memory loss	7 (39%)
Confused or in a state of shock	5 (28%)
Physically sick or nauseous	3 (17%)
Trouble sleeping	10 (50%)
Headaches	8 (44%)
Lack of appetitite (or overeating)	9 (50%)

LONGER-TERM REACTIONS

Volunteered Responses (Only)	
Scared	1 (8%)
Depressed	1 (8%)
Cold towards husband	2 (15%)
Can't trust husband	1 (8%)
Sad	1 (8%)
Decided to seek divorce	1 (8%)

relative, and that, with few exceptions, these discussions were helpful to the victim in dealing with the effects of the incident. Of those (3) who had not discussed the incident with someone close to them, two reported that they preferred not to, while only one indicated that no one was available. Clearly, wife assault victims (like the general victims discussed previously) are able to satisfy at least some of their need for counselling through their personal resources.

As was the case with the victims of general crime, emotional counselling and support services are available in Richmond to respond to the needs of wife assault victims. Once again, the survey data indicated that the level of awareness of available services was low. Even among the wife assault victims interviewed for this study, less than half were aware of the existence in Richmond of a transition house for 'battered wives.' One obvious implication of this finding (discussed above) concerns the need for enhancements in knowledge of available services among the police as well as agency personnel.

3. Practical needs

The wife assault victims who completed the first survey expressed needs for two types of practical assistance: emergency shelter and emergency transportation. A need for emergency shelter was indicated by five (27%) of the first survey respondents. To place this figure in context, it must be remembered that only 10 of the 18 victims interviewed were living with their assailants at the time of the assault. Of these ten individuals, three (30%) expressed a need for emergency shelter. Even among those not living with their assailants, two (25%) expressed a need for someplace where they would be safe from further abuse. Among the four victims who actually left home to seek shelter elsewhere, two were living with their assailants, and two were not. None of these individuals stayed at the transition house in Richmond -- three stayed with family or friends, and one stayed at a motel.

These findings point to emergency shelter as an important service for victims of wife assault. Many of these people who require emergency shelter will be able to stay with family members and friends at least for short periods. For others who either do not have, or choose not to use these resources, the services of NOVA Transition House are available in Richmond. Access to NOVA's services, however, is currently limited by two distinct problems: lack of public and police awareness of NOVA's services and lack of space in NOVA for all who seek shelter there.

As discussed above, the general level of awareness of available services in Richmond is quite low, both among victims and the police. The survey of assaulted wives, for example, indicated that only 44% of these individuals were aware of the existence of a transition house in Richmond. Despite this general lack of awareness, data provided by NOVA indicated that the demand for emergency shelter in Richmond generally exceeded the capacity of NOVA Transition House, meaning that women (many with children) seeking help were often turned away. One wonders what the demand for emergency shelter would be if more victims of wife assault were aware of its availability.

4. Information needs

The information needs of victims of wife assault focussed on two areas: information on help available from social service agencies, and information on criminal justice system procedures. On the first survey, eight (44%) of the victims interviewed expressed a need for advice on help available from social service agencies. This finding is consistent with our previous discussions of the general level of awareness of available social services among both victims and the police.

The perception that wife assault victims are in need of more information on criminal justice system procedures arises indirectly from several distinct pieces of information. Firstly, in all of 1982, only five cases of wife assault were tried in Richmond Family Court. Secondly, of the 18 victims

interviewed, only six indicated that they either had, or would likely lay charges against their assailants. This figure seems low given that there was at least some history of previous abuse in 15 (83%) of the cases studied, and that some form of treatment or restraint (counselling, be made to keep the peace) was viewed as appropriate by 14 (78%) of the victims surveyed. Finally, when asked why they were not laying charges, one victim reported a lack of knowledge about the procedures involved, and another indicated that she only wanted a court order to 'keep him away.' Taken together, these data suggest that wife assault victims in Richmond are not following through with charges as often as the circumstances of the cases would allow for. One reason for this may well be that they are unaware of both the range of options open to them, and of how to go about pursuing these options. It is incumbent upon both police and court personnel who deal with wife assault victims to be knowledgeable in these matters themselves, and to effectively communicate this knowledge to the victims they encounter in their work.

5. Secondary needs

Due to the fact that the only contact which most of the wife assault victims we surveyed had with the justice system involved the police, this section of our report will focus on these victims' perceptions of police procedures and performance. As was the case for the general surveys, the wife assault victims typically reported satisfaction (overall) with the way in which the police responded to their problems. The only area of apparent difficulty concerned the 'seven day cooling off period.' To briefly explain, Detachment policy on what were formerly called 'common' assault (not 'bodily harm', or wounding) complaints between spouses ('domestics') is to advise the complainant to contact the Intake Worker at the Richmond Family Court. The R.C.M.P. only take further action if requested to do so by Family Court. In other circumstances including 'common' assaults between strangers, the complainant is informed that they must wait at least seven days before swearing a 'private information' (laying a charge). The logic here is that, in many cases, once the complainant has had a chance to 'cool-off' and think things over, the matter is dropped. We found that there was

some confusion among the patrol officers as to whether the seven-day cooling-off period applied to 'domestics.' (This confusion has since been cleared up by the Officer in Charge of the Detachment.) The net effect of 'seven-day rule' from the wife assault victim's perspective is that aside from calming things down for the moment and then leaving, the police have done little to protect her from further abuse (at least for a week). For some victims, this is not a satisfactory situation. Some victims do want charges laid against their assailants (6 of 18 in our sample). Among the wife assault victims interviewed for this study, only five (28%) reported being advised by the police to lay charges themselves, or being advised by the police to go to Family Court (or their lawyer) about laying charges, and in no case did the police lay charges themselves against the victims' assailants (even though seven of these individuals were injured).

The circumstances surrounding the laying of charges in wife assault cases are complex. On the one hand, the victims we interviewed reported that the incident 'of record' was traumatic for them. At the same time, they indicated that this was (typically) not an isolated event -- most had been abused on more than one occasion in the past. On the basis of these data, logic would predict that most of the victims would proceed to lay charges. Such was not the case however. Although six of the victims indicated their intention to lay charges, this only occurred in three cases. The stated reasons for not laying charges varied widely but few victims cited specific problems with the responses of the justice system. Unfortunately, the survey did not determine whether more of the victims wanted charges laid by someone other than themselves. When asked about the punishment (or treatment) which they recommended for their assailants, the most frequent responses were that he should receive professional help (55%), and/or be required to stay away from the victim (39%). The criminal justice system sanctions of imprisonment and fines were mentioned relatively infrequently.

So the police find themselves in a dilemma. On one hand, there is pressure to charge exerted by some victims, and by society at large. On the other hand, most victims do not want to pursue 'legal avenues' to their logical

conclusions (meaning imprisonment or fines). Instead, they want the abuse to stop, and they want their assailants to receive professional help. In some cases, these two objectives will conflict.

Current R.C.M.P. policy requires that charges be laid promptly in all cases where sufficient evidence is present to substantiate the charges. Where evidence is lacking, the R.C.M.P. member attending the call should inform the victim of both the process to be followed in contacting Family Court, and of the availability of community resources to assist her.

A supplementary strategy worthy of further examination would be to make arrangements whereby 'wife batterers' from Richmond will be referred to the Battering Husbands Treatment Group currently operating in Vancouver. Whether these referrals can best be made as part of a batterer's sentence, or as an alternative to being tried in the first place is a matter requiring further investigation.

The great advantage of the Treatment Group relative to legal sanctions is that it would lead to a potentially constructive outcome from laying charges. The assaulted wives we interviewed did not (for the most part) want their assailants fined or imprisoned. That these were the anticipated results of laying charges may have deterred some victims from doing so. By being able to offer an attractive alternative to fine/imprisonment, the laying of charges may become a more palatable option for many assaulted wives.

6. Comparison with other studies

Two major studies of wife assault have been reported in Canada recently. Levens and Dutton (1980) examined the role played by police officers in responding to domestic dispute calls, and assessed the impacts of improved training in this area. Jaffe and Burris (1982) described the integrated response to wife assault presently followed in London, Ontario, which involves all relevant elements of the justice and social service systems. In this section, the major

findings of the surveys of assaulted wives in Richmond are summarized in the context of these other two studies.

A major theme in all three studies was the need for police to lay charges in all cases where substantiating evidence was available. Related to this was the expressed need for alternatives to traditional justice system sanctions (fines, imprisonment) such as compulsory treatment programs for batterers.

Police sensitivity to the problems faced by wife assault victims was another recurring issue. The Richmond data indicated that the reported incidents were often highly traumatic for the victims involved. Levens and Dutton emphasized the importance of training police officers to deal with the particular difficulties posed by interspousal conflicts.

Finally, the necessity of establishing a coordinated response to the needs of individual wife assault victims was emphasized in the London study. The Richmond findings also indicated that knowledge of available services among both justice systems personnel and within the social service community is limited. In order for victims to achieve ready access to available services in Richmond, some relatively formalized mechanism for education and referrals will be required.

C. CROWN WITNESSES

The philosophy underlying the development of the witness surveys differed somewhat from that followed in the case of the victim questionnaires. Rather than asking for respondent perceptions (typical of the victim surveys), the witness questionnaire documented 'what happened' to each respondent. One result of this approach is that the findings are largely factual in nature, and do not invite extensive interpretation. It will, therefore, be useful at this point to provide a brief overview of the factual data on the experiences of the witnesses surveyed, before moving to a discussion of the needs of these individuals.

1. Overview of factual data

a) Time relationships. Data were gathered on three time periods relevant to the experience of subpoenaed Crown witnesses:

- The elapsed time between the crime and the completion of the trial (gathered from police and court records).
- The elapsed time between the crime and receipt of the subpoena.
- The elapsed time between receipt of the subpoena and the first court appearance (gathered from the witness survey).

The average elapsed time between the crime and the completion of the trial was 7.1 months. Approximately, 88% of all trials involving (interviewed) witnesses were completed within 10 months of the occurrence of the crime. The extreme case involved an elapsed time of 27 months.

With respect to the elapsed time between the crime and receipt of the subpoena, the witnesses estimated that half received their subpoenas within two months or less of the crime. Most of the rest were subpoenaed within 3-9 months of the crime. Only two witnesses were subpoenaed more than nine months after the crime.

Finally, witnesses were also asked to estimate the elapsed time between receipt of the subpoena and their first court appearance. Approximately one in five reported a two-week (or less) elapsed time between subpoena receipt and court appearance. Longer times reported were 3 to 4 weeks (22%), 5 to 9 weeks (27%), 3 to 6 months (27%) and longer than six months (4%).

b) Receipt and understanding of the subpoena. Only one witness in three received the subpoena his or herself. For the others, either it was received

by someone else (typically a relative or co-worker) or picked up at the sheriff's office. (Service of subpoenas in Richmond is the responsibility of the sheriff's office.) Only six witnesses asked questions of the person who delivered the subpoena. These few questions concerned the nature of the document, the date of the required appearance and other miscellaneous issues. Over 90% of the witnesses indicated that they understood their requirement to appear in court. Of those who reported a lack of understanding, their questions mostly focussed on court procedures (6%). When asked how they knew of their legal requirement to testify, the most frequent responses were:

- From reading the subpoena (57%).
- General knowledge (30%).
- Previous experience (3%).
- From information supplied by the police (4%).

c) Pre-statement awareness of potential requirement to testify. Witnesses were asked whether they were aware (prior to making their statement to police) of the potential need for them to appear in court. Three out of four witnesses indicated that they were aware of this possibility. Typically, this awareness was based on general knowledge and on information provided by the police. Only 14 of 90 witnesses interviewed (16%) indicated that they just became aware of their need to testify only when they received the subpoena.

d) Legal advice sought by witnesses. Only six of the witnesses interviewed (7%) indicated that they sought legal assistance or advice. Of these, five were victims of the crimes being tried. Three contacted their own lawyers while the other two contacted legal aid in one case, and the defense lawyer in the other. The reasons provided for making these contacts related to being better prepared for court. Most of these contacts were made prior to receipt of the subpoena.

e) Contact with justice system personnel following subpoena receipt. Contact with someone in the justice system following receipt of the subpoena was sought by 16 of the witnesses interviewed (18%). Half of these individuals were employees of victimized businesses. The individuals most frequently contacted were the police, the Crown Prosecutor and the Clerk of the Court. Thirteen of these witnesses (81%) reported that making these contacts was either very or fairly easy. The questions most often asked concerned the need for the individual to testify and the possibility of changing the date of the trial. The responses to these questions were reported by 14 (87%) of these witnesses as being either very or fairly helpful.

f) Contact with justice system personnel prior to court date. Of the witnesses interviewed, 28 (31%) reported speaking with the police at least once prior to the trial. These contacts typically involved discussion on the need to appear in court and review of the witness' statement. Few witnesses were given any instruction on court procedures. The vast majority of the witnesses interviewed (85%) reported at least one contact with the Crown Prosecutor prior to the trial. In most of these contacts, the witnesses were reminded of the need for them to appear, were told what would happen in court and reviewed their statements.

g) Witness intimidation. As a general lead-in to this sensitive topic, witnesses were asked whether they had felt 'upset or frightened in any way' since being interviewed by the police. Of the total of 90 witnesses interviewed, 26 (29%) replied in the affirmative to this question. Victim/witnesses, in particular, reported being upset over the entire incident and frightened by the accused person. The remainder of those general responses seemed to reflect unease with court procedures. As a further probe, witnesses were asked more directly whether they felt that anyone had tried to influence their testimony. Aside from comments relating to the behaviour of the attorneys, only one witness directly stated that he had been threatened by friends of the accused.

h) Reception at court. The vast majority of the witnesses interviewed (92%) reported talking to someone before the trial. The most frequently mentioned contacts were:

- The Crown Prosecutor (73%).
- The police officer who took the witness' statement (20%).
- Other witnesses (18%).

These discussions focussed on what to expect in court (39%) and the witness' statements (46%).

i) Trial experience. Of the 90 witnesses interviewed, 85 (94%) did testify on the date they were requested to appear. Of those who did not, four of the five had their cases delayed, and the fifth was not needed. Eighty-nine per cent of the witnesses spent half a day or less in court. Ten per cent spent one full day, and only one witness was required for more than one day. Only two witnesses were required to attend court again after the first day.

j) Post-trial contact with the Crown Prosecutor. The Crown Prosecutor was in contact with only 20 (22%) of the witnesses following completion of their trials. The most frequent topics of these discussions were:

- The outcome of the case.
- Court procedures.

In the rest of this section, we discuss selected aspects of the findings of the witness surveys under the headings of financial needs, practical needs and information needs.

2. Financial needs

The only major financial impact reported by the witnesses interviewed for this study involved salary losses. Over 80% of the witnesses interviewed were employed at the time of the trial. Of these individuals, 21 (29%) reported some loss of salary as a result of their court appearance. The average amount of loss reported was $92.00 with losses ranging from $14 to $300 in the case of a self-employed fisherman.

The extent of reported salary loss is somewhat surprising in that the vast majority of the witnesses interviewed made only one court appearance for (typically) less than half a day. Apparently, the employers of many of these individuals were unwilling to allow time off with pay for court duty. Prior to mid 1982, witnesses were paid $6 per day for their court time. This practice was discontinued in the summer of 1982. In the context of average salary losses of $92, it is unlikely that a $6 witness fee is going to be missed much. More to the point would be some means of encouraging employers not to 'dock' their employees' paycheques for time spent acting as a Crown witness.

3. Practical needs

The survey covered both problems relating to arrangements necessary to attend court, and problems encountered at the courthouse. Only 16 witnesses (18%) reported any problems in arranging for their court appearance. The most frequently mentioned were: getting time off work (13%), missing a day of school (2%), and arranging transportation (2%).

In terms of problems experienced upon arrival at the court, frequent mentions were: finding parking (19% -- even though the courthouse is adjacent to a large shopping mall), finding the courtroom (8%), uncomfortable waiting room (21%), and a long wait before appearing (73% -- although most witnesses spent half a day or less in total at court).

So aside from some difficulties with their employers, the survey data indicate that subpoenaed Crown witnesses in Richmond do not experience extensive practical problems in the course of their court appearances.

4. Information needs

Many first-time witnesses will be unfamiliar with the procedures followed in court. They may not be able to identify the various actors in the process, or understand the functions of these individuals in the courtroom. They may also have no knowledge of what is expected of them, or of their duties and rights as witnesses. Roughly half of the witnesses interviewed for this study indicated that more advance information about court procedures would have been helpful to them. This was particularly true for witnesses who were also the victims of the offenses tried. In spite of this expressed need for more information, only 7% of the witnesses interviewed sought legal advice or assistance prior to the trial. Again, most of these individuals were the victims of the offenses tried.

There are legal advice services available to Richmond residents (in addition to the services of private lawyers). For individuals seeking general advice on court procedures, a more appropriate means of providing this information may be to distribute an information pamphlet along with each witness' subpoena. A draft version of such a pamphlet was prepared for use in B.C. but never put into general use.

The final area of information need reported in the witness surveys was concerned with information about the outcome of the trials in which the witnesses participated. Almost 20% of the witnesses interviewed for this study did not know whether their trial had ever been completed (they all were). In view of the importance of witness cooperation to the functioning of the justice system, and given that witness fees are no longer paid in B.C., some strategy to both inform witnesses about trial outcomes (including sentences) and thank them for their time and trouble seems justified. One straightforward means of accomplishing these objectives would be to send a letter from the office of the Crown Prosecutor containing this information to each subpoenaed witness.

IV

THE ROLE OF RESEARCH

The research discussed in this report was designed with two objectives in mind. The first was to ensure that decisions on the kinds of services to implement in Richmond would be based on sound information as to which services are most needed. The second objective of this project was to provide some of the information needed if the effectiveness of possible future initiatives is to be evaluated. In this brief concluding chapter of our report, we examine the extent to which this project has met its intended objectives.

In general, the data gathered in the course of this study indicated that major new initiatives were not required to meet the needs of crime victims and witnesses in Richmond. Rather, the optimum approach sufficient to meet identified needs would involve certain changes in criminal justice system procedures, and improved integration and coordination of existing services. The only exception to this general finding concerns the needs of wife assault victims. While the data gathered for this study on the problem of wife assault reflected the experiences of relatively few individuals, it was apparent from these data that many of these people are in need of more positive support from the police and courts, as well as from society at large. Research conducted in London, Ontario, has shown that in order for the justice system's response to assaulted wives achieve its objectives, the active participation of all elements of the system is required.

The second objective of this study was to provide baseline data to support possible future evaluation of victim services. The data gathered are not in themselves intrinsically interesting for the most part, but are nevertheless available to the interested reader in Volume II. Their value will only be evident should an evaluation of some future victim initiative be undertaken.

One might conclude that the results of this study were neither exciting nor dramatic. Few of the individuals studied involved violence or injuries. Large property losses were rare. With few exceptions, the individuals involved believed that the justice system had treated them well. Most expressed a willingness to cooperate with the police and courts again in the future, should the need arise. The portrait painted in this report has not been one of brutalized victims shabbily treated by the police and the courts. Certainly, areas of potential improvement were identified. But the general thrust of these improvements is to modify current procedures and to integrate and coordinate existing services. There was little, if any, need identified for new service agencies. Data indicating that new services are not required may not make for the most interesting reading. However, they are as important and valuable as more dramatic results in terms of their policy implications, if only because in times of fiscal restraint, it is as important to avoid doing that which is not necessary as it is to respond to identified needs. Hopefully, this study will help to target future victim initiatives in Richmond on those problems which most require attention.

REFERENCES

Bourque, B.B., Brumback, G.B., Krug, R.E. and Richardson, L.O. Crisis Intervention: Investigating the Need for New Applications. Prepared for U.S. National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice. Washington, D.C.: American Institute for Research, 1978.

Brickey, S.L. Winnipeg Victim/Witness Assistance Program: Planning Phase. Winnipeg, Institute for Social and Economic Research, 1982.

Brown, S.D. and Yantzi, M. Needs Assessment for Victims and Witnesses of Crime. Kitchener, Mennonite Central Committee, 1980.

Cronin, Roberta C. and Bourque, Blair B. National Evaluation Program Phase I Assessment. Victim/Witness Assistance Projects. Draft Final Report. Prepared for the U.S. Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. Washington, D.C.: American Institute for Research, 1979.

Evans, J., Himelfarb, A., Leger, G., Catlin; G., Ingram, S., Corrado, R., Glackman, W. and Roesch, R. Victimization in Greater Vancouver. A report prepared for the Research Division, Ministry of the Solicitor General, n.d.

Friedman, Kenneth, Bischoff, Helen, Davis, Robert, and Person, Andresa. Victims and Helpers: Reactions to Crime. Summary. Prepared for the National Institute of Justice. New York, New York: Victim Services Agency. n.d.

Jaffe, P. and Burris, C. An Integrated Response to Wife Assault: A Community Model. Report prepared for the Solicitor General of Canada, 1982.

Levens, B. and Dutton, D. The Social Service Role of Police -- Domestic Crisis Intervention. Report prepared for the Solicitor General of Canada, 1980.

McLeod, L. Wife Battering in Canada: The Vicious Circle. Ottawa: Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women, 1980.

Meredith, C. Overview and Annotated Bibliography of the Needs of Crime Victims. Report prepared for the Solicitor General of Canada, 1983.

Muir, J. Needs and Services for Crime Victims. Calgary: Calgary Police Service, 1982.

Norquay, Geoff and Weiler, Richard. Services to Victims and Witnesses of Crime in Canada. Ottawa, Ontario: Solicitor General of Canada, 1981.

Searson, P.D. Crime Victim Needs and Services - Ottawa, Ontario. Ottawa: University of Ottawa, 1982.

Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs. Wife Battering: A Report on Violence on the Family. Ottawa: Author, 1982.

Waller, I. and Okihiro, N. Burglary and the Public. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978.

APPENDIX A

TABLE OF CONTENTS OF VOLUME II: TECHNICAL REPORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I INTRODUCTION

II THE SURVEY INSTRUMENTS

- A. THE FIRST GENERAL VICTIM QUESTIONNAIRE
- B. THE SECOND GENERAL VICTIM QUESTIONNAIRE
- C. THE FIRST WIFE ASSAULT QUESTIONNAIRE
- D. THE SECOND WIFE ASSAULT QUESTIONNAIRE
- E. THE WITNESS QUESTIONNAIRE
- F. THE AGENCY QUESTIONNAIRE

III DETAILED FINDINGS

- A. TABULATED RESULTS OF FIRST GENERAL VICTIM SURVEY
- B. TABULATED RESULTS OF SECOND GENERAL VICTIM SURVEY
- C. TABULATED RESULTS OF FIRST WIFE ASSAULT SURVEY
- D. TABULATED RESULTS OF SECOND WIFE ASSAULT SURVEY
- E. TABULATED RESULTS OF WITNESS SURVEY
- F. THE AGENCY INVENTORY

APPENDIX B

SAMPLE VICTIM INFORMATION FORM (VIF)

APPENDIX B LOCATION: _____

VICTIM INFORMATION FORM

Occurence Number _____ Date of occurence _____

Time of day of occurence _____

Police Crime Classification _____

CCS Victimization Type (check one only)

1. Threat and/or attack only ____
2. Loss and/or damage only ____
3. Combined 1 and 2 above ____

Reported for infor/insurance only ____

Victim age Minor ____ 16-60 Years ____ Senior (over 60) ____

Victim sex Male ____ Female ____

Victim race White ____ Native ____ Other ____ Not stated ____

Relationship of offender/suspect to victim:

Spouse or ex-spouse ____
Family member ____
Other acquaintance ____
None (stranger) ____
Unknown (no I.D.) ____
Undetermined ____
Boyfriend/Live-in ____

Victim Name: _____

Victim Address: _____

Telephone Number: _____

Place of occurrence:

Residential ____
Commercial ____
Vehicle ____
Public building ____
Outside ____
Undetermined ____

Brief description of occurrence: _____

Extent of injury:

None
Injury indicated - medical attn not required
Injury indicated - medical attn required
Not stated

Estimated amount of loss: $____(Gross)

What was damaged/taken? _____

Date form completed: _____ Form completed by: _____

APPENDIX C

SAMPLE WITNESS INFORMATION FORM (WIF)

CANADIAN FACTS

1/6 [7-1] OCCURENCE NUMBER 82-

WITNESS INFORMATION SUSPECT NAME: _____

****

OFFICE USE ONLY

DATE TRIAL CONCLUDED

Day 8/9 _____ Month 10/11 _____ Year 12/13

CHARGE TRIED (C.C.SECTION)

_____ 14-15-16-

DATE OF OFFENSE

DD 18/19 MM 20/21 YR 22/23

TRIAL OUTCOME

Charge dismissed	17-1
Charge withdrawn	2
Found not-guilty	3
Found guilty	4

COURT FILE NUMBER: [| | | | | | | | |]

TYPE OF SENTENCE

Prison 27-1 _____ 28/29 Months OR _____ 30/31 Years

Probation 32-1 _____ 33/34 Months OR _____ 35/36 Years

Fine 37-1 $ _____ 38/42

Absolute Discharge -2

WITNESS WAS VICTIM YES 43-1 NO 2 NOT CLEAR 3

****

WITNESS NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

TELEPHONE RESIDENCE _____

CALL NO	1	2	3
DATE	_____	_____	_____
NO RING / NOT IN SERVICE	44-1	45-1	46-1
NO ANSWER	-2	-2	-2
BUSY -1	☐	☐	☐
-2	☐	☐	☐
-3	-3	-3	-3
RESPONDENT NOT KNOWN	-4	-4	-4
RESPONDENT NOT AT HOME	-5	-5	-5
APPOINTMENT _____			
RESPONDENT REFUSAL	-6	-6	-6
EXPLAIN _____			
TERMINATION (SPECIFY _____)	-7	-7	-7
COMPLETION	-8	-8	-8